



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,278	07/11/2001	Philip M. Walker	10012790-1	9299

7590 02/07/2006  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TRAN, TONGOC

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on November 10, 2005. Claims 1-26 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 10, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that there is no motivation to combine the cited prior art Barritz and Krishnaswami. Applicant states that the reason there is *"no motivation or suggestion to combine the purported teaching of Krishnaswami with Barritz at least because the information desired by the Barritz system is actual usage of a program module of Barritz ("mak[ing] it possible for a company to cancel maintenance or rental on unused or under-used products" (Barritz, column 2, lines 65-67). Accordingly while Barritz appears to be directed toward monitoring and reporting actual usage of a program module. Applicants' invention is instead directed toward determining whether a target computer system has been altered. Accordingly, there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the Barritz reference as suggested by the Examiner other than Applicants' disclosure, which is improper". Applicant appears to argue the difference between Barritz and Applicant's invention but does not address why there is no motivation to combine the teaching of Barritz and Krishnaswami.*

*A target as Applicant clarify from the Specification page 3 defines as client systems, that may be a computers, servers and other equipment leased to customers*

Art Unit: 2134

*on a usage-based billing model. Barritz teaches monitoring actual usage of particular software products installed on a computer system. Barritz states in col. 1, lines 55-65, that there is concern that software product may be used by more users than the number of which they are licensed or by unauthorized users. Therefore, at least one of the reasons for monitoring the actual usage of the products installed in the system is to uncover unauthorized usage (col. 2, lines 65-67). Barritz describes the monitor program records pertinent information in a recorded information log when certain event occurs (col. 6, lines 32-35). Barritz further discloses that the monitoring program can also be used to ensure compliance with licenses, both in terms of whether a given computer is licensed to use a given software product and whether the licensed number of users on a given system computer has been exceed...In a preferred embodiment monitoring program checks the list whenever an event occurs which would require authorization, e.g. program execution (col. 10, lines 23-43). Therefore, in both instances, checking recorded information against what is stored in order to verify or performs authorization is necessary. Since Barritz does not provide detail disclosure of the how the monitored information is check and verify, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to look to Krishnaswami's verification technique to query the database for stored information to determine whether the inquiring file is legitimate. In light of the interpretation of this teaching in Barritz and Krishnaswami. Examiner asserts that the rejection of Barritz in view of Krishnaswami is proper.*

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barritz (U.S. Patent No. 5,499,340) in view of Krishnaswami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,735, hereinafter Krishnaswami).

In respect to claim 1, Barritz discloses a system comprising:  
a target; a probe operable to execute in the target and collect a predetermined set of data associated with the target; and a monitor operable to receive the collected predetermined set of data (e.g. col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 8, col. 10, lines 1-22 and line 65-col. 11, line 24). Barritz does not explicitly disclose comparing said data with expected data values to determine whether the target has been altered. However, Krishnaswami discloses comparing information with protected information stored in the database to verify whether information has been altered (Krishnaswami, col. 7, lines 9-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of initiating a probe to collect data at a target system to uncover unauthorized usage of product taught by Barritz with the teaching integrity file checking taught by Krishnaswami in order to ensure information has not been altered (Krishnaswami, col. 7, lines 21-25).

In respect to claim 2, Barritz and Krishnaswami disclose the system, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the probe is resident in the target (Barritz, e.g. col. 10, lines 1-17).

In respect to claim 3, Barritz and Krishnaswami disclose the system, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the monitor is operable to send the probe to the target for execution (Barritz, e.g. col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 8 and col. 10, lines 1-22).

In respect to claim 4, Barritz and Krishnaswami disclose the system, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the probe repeatedly executes and the predetermined set of data varies for each execution of the probe (Barritz, e.g. col. 9, lines 28-46 and col. 10, lines 18-22).

In respect to claim 5, Barritz discloses the system, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the predetermined set of data includes system attributes and system usage data (Barritz, e.g. col. 10, lines 1-22).

In respect to claims 10-14, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 1-5. Therefore, claims 10-14 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 19-23 and 26, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 1-5. Therefore, claims 19-23 and 26 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 25, Barritz and Krishnaswami disclose the method, as set forth in claim 23, further comprising generating billing data based on the system usage data in response to the system attribute data being verified (Barritz, e.g. col. 1, lines 35-45).

4. Claims 6-9, 15-18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barritz (U.S. Patent No. 5,499,340) in view of Krishnaswami (U.S.

Art Unit: 2134

Patent No. 6,618,735) and further in view of Bruce Schneier ("Applied Cryptography, Second Edition, Protocols, Algorithms and Source Code in C", 1996, pages 30-31, 41-44 and 48-50).

In respect to claims 6-9, Barritz and Krishnaswami disclose the system, as set forth in claim 1. Barritz does not disclose wherein the probe is operable to calculate a signature value of at least a portion of an execution image of the probe; to compare the calculated signature value to an expected signature value; to determine a signature value of a random subset of an execution image of the probe; to generate an encryption key from the signature value for encrypting the collected predetermined set of data. However, Schneier discloses using digital signature with encryption to authenticate the integrity of data transmitted over the network (Schneier, e.g. pages 30-31, 41-44 and 48-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Barritz's monitoring computer usage over the network with Schneier's teaching of digital signature to authenticate the data received to ensure the integrity of the data transmitted over the network.

In respect to claims 15-17, the claim limitation is similar to claims 2-4. Therefore, claims 15-17 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 18, Barritz and Krishnaswami disclose the method, as set forth in claim 17, further comprising: sending the data to a monitor, the data including system attribute data and system usage data; verifying the system attribute data; and generating billing data based on the system usage data in response to the system attribute data being verified (e.g. col. 1, lines 35-45, col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 8, col. 10,

Art Unit: 2134

lines 1-22 and line 65-col. 11, line 24). Barritz does not disclose sending an encrypted data to a monitor and decrypting the encrypted data using a decryption key. However, Schneier discloses encrypting and decrypting data using public key system (Schneier, e.g. pages 20-31, 41-44 and 48-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of public key encryption system taught by Schneier with Barritz's monitoring of computer usage to protect transmitted data from being tampered.

In respect to claim 24, the claim limitation is similar to claims 18. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2134


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Examiner: Tongoc Tran  
Art Unit: 2134

February 6, 2006

  
**MATTHEW SMITHERS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*Art Unit 2137*